

Application No.: 09/783,598
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated September 9, 2004
Reply to the Office Action dated June 17, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 16 remain pending in the present application. Claims 7 – 16 were withdrawn from consideration. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over **Nakahara** (JP 04-099372A). Claims 1 – 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over **Otagawa et al.** (USP 5,294,504). Claims 4 – 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Otagawa**, in view of **Nakahara**. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Nakahara** or **Otagawa**, in view of **Onishi et al.** (USP 5,459,368).

However, nothing in the cited prior art discloses the present claimed **front-and-back** electrically conductive substrates. The cited prior art describe posts that are formed on top of a substrate of a semiconductor device. These semiconductor devices are not front-and-back electrically conductive substrates.

Independent claim 1, as amended, clarify that the posts that extend *through* the substrate to provide front and back electrical conductivity across both surfaces of the substrate. The cited prior art posts do not extend through the substrate. In addition, amended claim 1 clarifies that the insulative substrate is disposed *between* the two surfaces of the front-and-back electrically conductive substrate. The prior art insulative substrate is not between the two surfaces of the front-and-back electrically conductive substrate. Claim 1, as amended, more clearly define a **front-and-back** electrically conductive substrate that distinguishes over the semiconductor

Application No.: 09/783,598
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated September 9, 2004
Reply to the Office Action dated June 17, 2004

devices of the prior art. For at least these reasons, the present claimed invention, as amended, is in condition for allowance.

With regard to claim 4, the Office Action made the further reference to Nakahara for disclosing an alleged thin film 9 (which is recited in claim 5), but does not indicate how the cited prior art discloses the claimed pad recited in claim 4. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with regard to claim 4.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, or if the Examiner wishes additional explanations of the present invention, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



John P. Kong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40, 054

JPK:kal
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 822-1100